

702 R. 19.
3

THE
SURVEY and DEMAND
FOR
DILAPIDATIONS
IN THE
ARCHIEPISCOPAL SEE
OF
CANTERBURY,
JUSTIFIED,

Against the *Cavils* and *Misrepresenta-
tions*, contained in some LETTERS
lately published by Mr. Archdeacon
Tenison.

X. James (J.)

Fortunaque dulci
Ebrius ————— HOR.
De nullo quereris, nulli maledicis Apici,
Rumor aut lingue te tamen esse male. MAR.

L O N D O N:
Printed by WILLIAM HUNTER in *Jewin-street.*
M.DCC.XVII.

THE
SURVEY AND DEMAND
FOR
DILAPIDATIONS
IN THE
ARCHBISHOPAL SEE



Against the Canon and Miscellaneous
views, contained in some LETTERS
lately published by Mr. Archdeacon
Venison.

Printed by J. G. Smith, at the
Printers, in Pall Mall.

LONDON:
Printed by William Hunter in Strand.
MDCCLXXII.

To Mr. Archdeacon Tenison.

REVEREND SIR,



Receiv'd, by the Penny-post, the Favour of your two Printed Sheets, intituled, *The true Copies of some Letters, occasion'd by the Demand for Dilapidations, in the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury*; in the perusal of which, I am greatly surprized, to find, that you have treated, not only those who thought they had done you service in that Affair, but my Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury* himself, in a very injurious, and unworthy manner. I must therefore beg your Excuse, Sir, if I think it my Duty, upon this occasion, to set the Business of the Demand for Dilapidations, in the Palaces of *Lambeth* and *Croydon*, in a truer Light than your Letters have done; without having recourse to Detraction and Calumny.

As to your first Copy, which is that of a Letter to the Bishop of *Lincoln*, I shall only say, that for any Concern his Lordship had in the Dispute about these Dilapidations, a Letter to the Mayor of *Quinborough* had served full as pertinently for an Introduction.

Your next Letter, which is to Mr. *Fage*, from *Sundrich*, September 20th, 1716, bears a very late Date, in respect of most of the Transactions; and shews Mr. *Fage* had a great deal of Paience, to wait so long for Intelligence, in a matter which as nearly concerned him as your self. But however that be, since the World was to be favoured with that particular Account, which Mr. *Fage* then expected; it had been but just in you to have related the matter from the beginning: For it is highly disingenuous to make so loud Complaints, as you do, of the Exorbitancy of my Lord Archbishop's Demands, and at the same time to take no regular Notice of that Survey and Estimate, upon which the Justice of those Demands was founded.

I am sensible there was no need that Mr. *Fage*, who was privy to every step that was taken, should be informed of this; but 'tis requisite

the Publick should know, that my Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*, your self, and Mr. *Fage*, did all agree, that I should by my self survey, what Defects and Wants of Repair could be found in the Palaces of *Lambeth* and *Croydon*. At whose motion I was appointed to this Work, I know not; but as soon as I received the Intimation of it, which I had first from your self, I applied both to my Lord Archbishop and you, to have some body join'd with me in taking the View, which my Lord would have consented to, but you would not.

The Instructions I had from his Grace, for this Business, were only verbal; and imported, that I should take particular cognizance of whatever was found to be defective, and out of repair, in and about the Palaces before mentioned, without regarding at whose Expence it was to be made good. This, I believe, Sir, you may remember, I acquainted you with, and, upon your Consent given, did proceed accordingly; and when the Survey of *Lambeth* was finish'd, as it was about the middle of *March* last, I deliver'd it to you and Mr. *Fage* together, at *Lambeth House*. That of *Croydon* I sent you some time after by a Servant, the Receipt of which you acknowledged in yours of the 28th of *March*.

The Articles necessary to be taken notice of at *Lambeth House* especially, proved much more numerous than was expected, among which were a great many very considerable Defects in the Towers, Battlements, Roofs, Leads, Platforms, and Stone-wharf to the River; whence it was not difficult to guess, that the Charge of the Repairs would amount to some Thousand Pounds; and this you was acquainted with much sooner than my Lord of *Canterbury* was: For when I deliver'd my Survey of *Lambeth Palace* into your hands, you told me, there was no need of making a Duplicate of it at that time; forasmuch as you would in a few Days wait upon my Lord Archbishop with it, to consider of what could be done to bring things to an amicable Issue; which however you was so far from doing, that, about a Month after, I was call'd upon to write a Copy of the said Survey for his Grace's use, to whom you had not then thought fit to communicate that which had been so long in your custody, nor have you ever done it since.

It may not be improper to mention here, that when I waited upon you with this Narrative of the State of *Lambeth House*, Mr. *Fage* and you pressed me to point out to you, what Articles I thought might be reckon'd Dilapidations; which I declined, as not being my Province to determine. To how many Persons this was handed, for their Opinion about the matter, before my Lord Archbishop had any Copy of it, is best known to your self. But for what you affirm, of my acquainting his Grace underhand, and privately, with my Estimate of what the Repairs would amount unto; I take leave to inform you, 'tis entirely false; that I never made any other Estimation of the Repairs, than
what

what your Surveyor and Artificers were jointly concerned in, nor ever had Instructions from any one so to do : And therefore, as much a Secret as you reckon this piece of Advice, I cannot think but those who let you into it basely imposed upon you.

What passed between my Lord Archbishop and you, upon the Ninth of May, I am a Stranger to ; but 'tis odd, that his Grace should then express himself so clearly upon the Head of bringing the matter into *Westminster Hall*, and that you should so much depend upon a Trial there ; and yet that, upon your going into the Country, about ten Days after, there should need another Agreement to be made by your Agent Mr. *Edwards*. 'Tis very much to be suspected, that you your self had broke the original Agreement ; and it were to be wish'd, that you had quoted Mr. *Edwards's* Letter to my Lord of *Canterbury*, of the 26th of July, a little farther ; where he says : *When Mr. Archdeacon declined (I must say, to go on in the Method, as I thought, agreed to, and fully understood by both Parties) I thought your Grace ill used, and always most earnestly pressed him to proceed, as thinking in my conscience, that it was the best way of ending the matter on both sides.*

Does not this Confession of your Agent confute all you say, of having done every thing that was fit for you to do, towards ending this Dispute in an amicable way ? Or is this consistent with what you alledge, that his Grace had, by specious Pretences, drawn you in to permit your Workmen to join with his Grace's, in surveying the Palaces ? Was not your joining in the Survey, that which Mr. *Edwards* owns, he thought in his conscience the best way of ending the matter ? and was not your Refusal to go on in the Method agreed to, the Occasion of his confessing so frankly, that he thought his Grace was ill used ?

Your charging my Lord of *Canterbury* with drawing you in, by specious Pretences of coming to an amicable Accommodation, and afterwards insisting upon unreasonable Preliminaries ; is a Treatment that not only his Grace, but all, who have the Honour to know him, or are at all acquainted with his Character, have great reason to complain of, since there is not the least Appearance, that any thing unreasonable was ever proposed to you. It certainly behoved my Lord to be cautious, and to insist upon some Preliminaries to be settled, when he had to do with a Gentleman, who had so lately declined to go on in the Method first agreed upon.

As you are a Clergyman, his Grace might probably expect a Behaviour from you suitable to his high Station : But as his Grace was not so ignorant of your Circumstances, as to think you under any necessity of submitting patiently to the most legal Demand ; so he was better acquainted with your Temper, than to expect you willing to bear such Burthens, as the Laws of the Land do sometimes very justly lay upon Men.

Men. It may well be presumed then, that my Lord had little reason to think you would become his Slave by Unfaithfulness to your Trust, or be tame under such Oppression, as was likely to end in the parting with Money.

His Grace, no doubt, had very good Reasons for refusing to have a Trial at *Kingston* Assizes; but what Reason you could have to expect it there, is not very apparent. If it were only upon account of taking the Air, it may well be ranked with some other as wild Proposals, which I agree, deserve to be called by no softer Name than Amusements.

What you mean by the Transaction, which, you say, happen'd between his Grace and Mr. *Edwards*, while you was at *Canterbury*, and was not clearly understood by you; I know not; But this is certain, that the Executors did by themselves, or their Agent, agree, that a Surveyor (Mr. *Dickenson*) with a Mason, a Carpenter, a Bricklayer, and a Plummer on their side, should meet the like number of Persons on his Grace's part. Which, about the end of *May* last, was done accordingly, where every Article of my Survey was scanned by Mr. *Dickenson*, and eight Workmen. Whatever was found to be really defective, and out of repair, had the lowest Valuation put upon it, that, in the judgment of the several Artificers, would be required to make it good; and many things inserted in my Survey, rather by way of *Memorandum* than Demand, had no Value at all set upon them; as Inside Painting, White-washing, &c. Several others were but partly allowed, tho' of the most constant use, and quite worn out; such as the Sash-windows in general, with many of the Ceilings, Pavings, and such like.

The Valuation of these Repairs, made in so fair and impartial a manner, was the very Basis upon which the Equity of my Lord Archbishop's Demand subsisted; and yet you are pleased to take but very little notice of it, in your Letters. You just mention, indeed, in a place or two, that you left Directions with Mr. *Edwards*, to employ a Surveyor and Workmen on your part; but you say not a word of the Work they performed, tho', I presume, your Charge therein fell very little short of his Grace's. And to render this Affair still more obscure, you say, that you receiv'd from Mr. *Edwards* a fair Copy of Mr. *James*'s Survey, with Mr. *Dickenson*'s Observations thereupon; whereas, in truth, what Mr. *Edwards* sent you, was the Valuation of all such Particulars, as, in the opinion of Mr. *Dickenson*, my self, and the Artificers on both sides, were agreed to want Repairs; in which my Survey was of no farther service, than to point out the Places where the Defects lay.

After so impartial an Examination of this Affair, what room is there left for Complaint? Were not the Rates, set upon each Article, estimated by Persons wholly disinterested? For, as to Mr. *Dickenson* and myself, we determined not the Value of any thing, save where the
Work-

Workmen were divided in their Opinion, the Instances of which were very few and inconsiderable. And yet who can conceive, by your Letters, but that these exorbitant Demands (as you are pleased to call them) are of my Lord Archbishop's, or his Surveyor's own appraising and exacting, without so much as consulting any one Person on your part? Or why is my Lord's insisting upon the Sum of the Estimate so often stiled an unjust Demand, when no less than Ten Men, indifferent on both sides, are agreed, that the Repairs cannot be made good for less Money; and I may truly add, not for half as much more.

By your Account of this matter, you would have it believed, that the Survey and Estimate were wholly mine, and that your own Surveyor had no more to do with it, than to make his Observations upon it: And to confirm the truth of this, you transcribe Part of the Valuation, calling it my Survey; and taking in such Articles as you think most for your purpose, you conclude with the Estimate of the Wharf, and set my Name to it.

Certainly this is very ungenerous Usage, to put a Man's Name at the foot of an Account, which how true soever it be in itself, you never saw so subscribed to. I am far from denying the Truth of the Valuation put upon the Particulars you have quoted; but your way of representing this Affair is very disingenuous, not only with regard to the Articles you have picked out, but as it is your whole Drift to make the Estimate pass for the Act of a single Person, when, as I said before, there were Ten Men agreed concerning it.

For what you assert, that none of the present Bishops are possessed of two Houses, so antient as those at *Lambeth* and *Croydon*, that are in so good Repair, as both these Houses are; nor that there are in any County of *England*, ten Parsonage Houses, except such as have been built since the Fire of *London*, so well repaired: I shall only answer, that unless you are much better acquainted with the Condition of other Bishop's Houses, than you seem to be with that wherein you so much resided; you are not a competent Judge in the matter: For I dare aver, that even in *Lambeth House* you never saw half of those Places, where the principal Defects lie; and that, had you seen them, you would probably have pronounced as wisely concerning them, as you say the old Watermen did of the Wharf, viz. *That 'tis now as good as ever they remember it to be.*

For the Example this may give, to excite succeeding Bishops to sue the Executors of the present, and the Clergy that shall come hereafter, to vex the Executors of the present Incumbents: If the Demands upon them are no more exorbitant than in the Case before us, there will be no great Evil in the Precedent.

Let

Let it be consider'd, that the Sum demanded for these Dilapidations, is scarce a fortieth Part of the Amount of the Revenue, for the time the late Archbishop held the See ; and the Demand cannot be thought extravagant, at a time when the Palaces need so great Repair, as Ten Men, employ'd to view them, now report they do : When an Archbishop dies a Widower, and childless, and leaves behind him, perhaps, not less than six or seven Years Income of the Archbishoprick.

The Payment of such a Proportion as this, Sir, you may depend upon it, will never hurt the Executors of Bishops or Clergy, all Circumstances consider'd. Admit that a Clergyman, who has enjoy'd a Living of 200 *l. per Annum* more than twenty Years, dies without Wife or Child, and leaves behind him twelve or fourteen hundred Pounds, to Relations no ways indigent : Will ninety or a hundred Pounds, to support and repair a ruinous Habitation for the next Incumbent, who comes into it perhaps with a numerous Family, be thought an exorbitant Demand ? especially when there is an immediate Call for this, or a greater Sum, to prevent a Charge that would be the Ruin of any one Possessor. Can this be called, *tearing great Sums from poor Widows and Children, under colour of legal Right, and pretence of Dues for Dilapidations ?* Are the Defects in the Palaces of *Lambeth* and *Croydon* all imaginary then, after they have been viewed and estimated by so many Persons ? If so, I must own the Executors have a great deal of Injustice done them, and you have abundant Reason to exclaim against all concerned in the Survey, tho' none against my Lord Archbishop : His Grace certainly is blameless, even upon this supposition.

I am really sorry, Sir, you should so thoroughly misunderstand this whole matter. My Lord of *Canterbury* was no more present at the Inspection into the State of these Houses, than you were ; nor did his Grace ever give any Directions, that might induce those who made the Survey, to exaggerate the Sum of the Estimate one Farthing beyond what was truly just and equitable. You know it was left entirely to the Surveyors and Artificers, appointed by both Parties, to determine both what was really defective, and what the Charge of repairing the Defects would amount unto. Can my Lord Archbishop then, by suing for the Sum of this Valuation, deserve to be treated in so ignominious a manner ? as tho' the whole Business of the Dilapidations was a meer Sham, nothing but a feigned Pretence to get Money, and, under colour of legal Right, to obtain from the Executors such Sums, as were never likely to be applied to the purposes for which they were demanded.

If the Demands for Dilapidations are so exorbitant as you mention, your own Surveyor and Artificers are equally culpable with those appointed by my Lord of *Canterbury* : For, as his Lordship had no more hand in ascertaining the Value of them, than you had, his Grace is certain-

certainly innocent; and you ought to have shewed, that the Survey and Valuation was a Cheat, and that all who were concerned in it were Knaves and Villains, rather than to have dealt so freely with his Grace's Character, as you have done upon this Occasion.

One Proof you bring of the Exorbitancy of these Demands, is, that it is required of you to make good the Stone Work, that has been decaying for several Centuries. Is it then a greater Hardship for the Executors to contribute to make good part of the Stone Work now decaying, than will fall upon his Grace or his Successors, who are obliged to rebuild such Parts of the Palaces, as, through the Decay of this Stonework, will come to utter Ruin, if not timely prevented?

The Article of the Wharf is great indeed, as you say; but the Decay and Ruin of it is equally great, and undoubtedly has been much hasten'd by the Allowance given to fasten Timber to it; the Liberty of doing which, as I am informed, the Carpenters Company held by a Lease very lately expired. I am persuaded, this Lease was granted without the late Archbishop's privity; and I can't say but it may have been an ill Bargain for the Executors, since, without dispute, it has greatly contributed to bring the Wharf into that bad state, which all but old Women and old Watermen do now see it in.

The Money expended in Repairs for the last 20 Years, you say, is represented to be little or nothing. I suppose you mean, that little or nothing is to be seen for it; and this indeed is very true, but not to be wonder'd at: For out of the 3400 *l.* which you say has been expended, 2000 *l.* are reckoned to have been laid out at *Croydon*; and deducting the Charges of all jobbing Works done for the Conveniency and Service of the Family at *Lambeth*, by Bricklayers, Carpenters, Joiners, Plummers, Smiths, and Glaziers; which cannot well be computed at less than 70 or 80 Pounds *per Annum*; you will find but little of the 3400 *l.* left for repairing considerable Defects.

You say that you are called upon in such a manner, as may give you to understand, that you are not only to make the Palace strong and firm, but that you must provide for Ornamentts, and make it magnificent. This, I confess, is so notorious an Untruth, that I could not read it without astonishment, there not being one single Article in the whole Survey, demanded for any such purpose, unless you reckon the Support of the Towers and Battlements to be a Work of Magnificence only.

The Window-frames of Stone, which you bring in as Pieces of Magnificence, are as essential to the Strength and Security of the Fabrick, as the Walls themselves; and when they fail, unless great Care be taken, the Wall will sink with them. And the same may be said of the Stone-

Coins, which are laid into the Corners of these Buildings, for Strength, and not for Ornament only. It is no wonder therefore, if the Charge of repairing both these rises very high, when the Defect in them is general, and the ill Consequence too apparent. How then can it be said, that the Palaces of *Lambeth* and *Croydon* are in good repair, when there is so great a number of the Stone-windows, Coins and Coping-stones, moldering and perished, as may be seen in both these Houses? And if these are to be taken no notice of, because they have been many Years decaying, this Argument will grow stronger by every Year's neglect; so that at length it will be thought very extravagant to expect that a Man should do any thing towards the Repair of a Fabrick, that is of greater Antiquity than his own Time.

It were to have been wished, Sir, that by your complying so far with his Grace, as to pay the full Sum demanded, you had merited, that some Historian might hereafter have celebrated your Character; but since this is not now to be hoped for, no Man can blame you for underraking the Office your self; and it must be acknowledged, that had the Publication of your Letters come from any other hand, they would scarcely have been look'd upon as genuine.

I am sorry, you so much disliked the Taste of the Survey; but if you would cast your Eye once more over what is demanded for the *Lollards Tower*, you'll find, the great Articles in it are, the Defects of the Roofing, Leads, Walls, Battlements, and Coin-stones; the Sum of which if you deduct from the 46*l.* you have quoted, there will be but little left to make it a more sightly Apartment for Hereticks, or such as in charity ought to be put under as close Confinement.

But whatever use this Tower has been, or may hereafter be put to, it is now in such a state, that it looks rather like a Part of *Bedlam*, than of an Archbishop's Palace. The Rain, through the want of Doors, Windows, and Glass, driving in upon the Stairs and Floors in sundry Places; and the Stone-Coins, Battlements and Copings, being now become so ruinous, not only in this, but in most of the other Towers, that these, which have hitherto been the most noble, as well as useful Parts of the old Structure, will, unless speedy care be taken, prove a Charge too great for any one Archbishop to go through with.

How much an Original my Survey may be, I know not; but it certainly behoves every Bishop, or other Clergyman, who comes into a House, which the Law obliges him to keep up and in good Repair, to have it carefully inspected; and where material Defects are found, he ought to have fair Allowances made for them, by the Executors of his Predecessor; for determining of which, it may be equitable to consider, not only the State of the Dwelling, but the Income of the Living,
the

the Time of the Predecessor's enjoying it, the Circumstances he died in, and perhaps too the Purposes to which, and the Condition of the Persons to whom he left his Wealth; for if it be evident from all these, that Monies may be spar'd without injuring the Executors; why should the Charges requisite to make the House habitable, lie wholly upon the Successor? Who it may be has a great Family, and can very ill bear the necessary Expence of coming into the Living. If you have therefore any thing more to publish upon the Subject of Dilapidations, it might be of Service to collect how many Clergymen have injur'd their Families by being necessitated, through the bad State of the Houses left them, to build anew, without being able to obtain from the Executors of their Predecessors (perhaps very wealthy) such Allowances as were in Justice due to them.

The Omission of the Smoak of the Kitchen Chimney I hope you'll pardon; you know that was pretty well over, e'er I went to *Lambeth* upon the Survey. But altho' I desire no better Entertainment than I found there in your time; yet I never understood that a great Smoak was a certain Sign of great Hospitality, any more than a mighty Outcry is a sure Token of great Sufferings: However, I don't remember to have ever heard any one reflect upon the late Archbishop's House-keeping, especially before he went over to *Lambeth-House*; and it would have looked better, had your Reflections upon the present Archbishop in this particular been respited a while; for very few, but those who are exceeding bad Men themselves, can be pleased to hear very great and good Men calumniated by way of Prediction.

By the Account you give us from Archbishop *Grindal's* Life, it appears, that there was so much exactness in the Surveys of former Days, as to make demands for Battlements of Stone, &c. and your Presumption that Executors did not then hold themselves obliged to pay for things of this kind, is no way conclusive; nor can it be supposed, that the Law, in case of a total Failure, through the Defect of these, should oblige a Man to rebuild, and have no regard at all to the Means, by which such Destruction is to be prevented.

The Sums paid for Dilapidations by the Executors of former Archbishops, are no certain Evidence that the Things specified in this Survey were not charg'd upon them. You yourself have instanced in *Battlements of Stone, &c.* that had been long in decaying, claimed from *Grindal's*: And no doubt but under the &c. were comprehended most of the particulars you make the greatest Objection to. But if these Things have been decaying, as you say they have, these five hundred Years, 'tis reasonable to think they were in a much better State one hundred and forty Years ago than they are at present; and consequently that 500 l.

then, might do as much service in Repairs as six times that Sum will now; especially when Allowance is made for the great Difference in the value of Money at that time and this.

In the Examples you produce of Sums formerly paid for Dilapidations in the See of *Canterbury*, you have unluckily named one, that, every thing considered, much exceeds the Demand made upon the late Archbishop's Executors; and that is, the 600 *l.* paid by Cardinal *Pole's* Executors to Archbishop *Parker*; for setting aside the great difference in the value of Money, as I said before, the Cardinal enjoyed the Archbishoprick but twenty one Months, the late Archbishop held it as many Years; and if the Income of the Archbishoprick be suppos'd worth twice as much at that Time as it now is, yet will the 600 *l.* paid by the Executors of the former be proportionally more than 4000 *l.* from the latter, regard being had to the different Term of their Lives in the See, and the respective Sums they received therefrom.

Nor was the 450 *l.* paid by Archbishop *Parker's* Executors, so inconsiderable as you esteem it, if the great Works he did at *Lambeth-House* but four Years before his Death be considered. Mr. *Strype* tells us in his Life of this Archbishop, p. 332. *That in the Year 1571. He repair'd and beautified his Palace at Lambeth. That he cover'd the great Hall with Shingles. That he made entirely the long Bridge which reacheth into the Thames. That the famous Summer-house in the Garden, built by Cranmer, and by length of Time almost decayed, was restor'd by him to its ancient Form and Beauty. That he repaired two Aqueducts for the use of the House and Garden: And that he made Conveyances under ground to cleanse and keep the House sweet by Sinks, to carry away the Filth into the Thames by the ebbing and flowing of the River. These Works, as the same Author observes, cost him a very great Sum of Money; and the last mentioned sufficiently shews that he had not only regard to such Repairs as are commonly expected, but that he spared no Cost to render the Palace more healthy and convenient.*

What was offered by Archbishop *Grindal's* Executors, which you say was 250 *l.* (tho' I don't understand that it was accepted) was in all likelihood, more than they could well part with. The Archbishop, as Mr. *Cambden* observes, leaving very little Wealth behind him, tho' he filled the See about eight Years; which agrees with that Mr. *Strype* says of him, viz. *That it was his Care to preserve the Revenues of the Sees over which he presided, and to keep the Houses in Repair, by laying out largely for that intent yearly; and that he left the Houses in so good a state, that they might for ever be kept in sufficient Repair; with as little or less yearly Charge than he bestowed upon them.* All which is very probable; and the small stock of Wealth he left behind him, is a good Evidence of the Truth of it; but altho' the late Archbishop's Conduct might be in some respects like *Grindal's*,

dal's, the Temper of the People that were about them might be very different ; and this no more argues, that the State and Condition of their Houses should be alike at the Time of their Decease, than that the Estates they left behind them should be so ; and that these were vastly different, I suppose needs no proof.

What Timber there was left upon the Estate by Archbishop *Grindal*, is uncertain : Had any of his Executors given an account of it, when the Dilapidations were in dispute, the truth thereof might have been question'd. For what you your self so positively affirm, That there is now standing so considerable a Stock of Timber-trees, in the Parish of *Lambeth* and *Croydon*, and in the Woods about *Canterbury*, preserved by the late Archbishop, during the space of twenty Years, that there needs not one Stick to be bought for the Repairs of the Palaces, and Buildings thereunto belonging ; is so far from being true, that, as far as appears by a late Survey taken of the Timber in all the said Woods, there are not so many Timber-trees upon the whole, as are worth 150 *l.* if every one of them was to be cut down : And I very well remember, when this Dispute was before the Arbitrators, you then insisted upon 737 *l.* to be abated, in consideration of Timber charged in the Survey, which you alledged might be found upon the Estate.

Having done with your First Part, which I was more particularly concerned to speak to, I have but little to say to your Second, most of that being already sufficiently answer'd by Mr. *Farrant*.

What you alledge, that little or nothing was paid for Dilapidations, in 7 or 8 Bishopricks you mention, is nothing to the present purpose : Some of those Bishops Houses, perhaps, were left in very good repair ; and where they were not so, it is probable nothing was left to make them better. I heartily wish, that none of their present Lordships may be obliged to rebuild what their Predecessors ought in justice to have contributed to the Support of, for these 70 or 80 Years past ; but neglected. Things of this nature usually fall very heavy at last, and a ruinous Fabrick will not stand a Day the longer for being carelessly surveyed, or for an Executor's pronouncing it in good Repair.

What is here repeated, *pag. 5.* of the Sums paid by *Pole's*, *Parker's*, and *Grindal's* Executors, I have already spoken to ; but your affirming, that 3469 *l.* is the lowest Sum demanded by his present Grace, for beautifying both his Palaces, is a most shameful Untruth, and an infamous Piece of Scandal. How can you publish this of your Metropolitan, who, if you are in your Senses, must know, as well as I do, that there is not one single Article, in the whole Valuation of the Survey, allowed upon the account of Beauty or Ornament, but purely for the Support and Service of the Fabrick ? What Credit can be given to any thing

thing you say upon this Subject, when you set your self thus to contradict all Mankind? When Ten Men, accusom'd to things of this nature, have view'd the Palaces at Noon-day, in the Company of your own Agent, and unanimously report, that these Defects are real, and require so much Money to repair them; you tell the World 'tis false, and that there is nothing but beautifying the Palaces intended.

Not even that neither; for in your next Paragraph you say, this Sum is sufficient to purchase an Estate of 170*l. per Annum*, to be settled on his Grace's Family for ever. Admit it be so, you cannot be ignorant, that as it is impossible it should be so applied; it is so much the more base to suggest it. You very well know, his Grace forfeits double the Sum, if what is given for the Dilapidations be not laid out for that purpose; to what end then can these Insinuations serve, but to vilify and scandalize the Archbishop?

You seem in this Part to aim at a Vindication of the late Archbishop's and your Uncle *Tenison's* Characters. That of the Archbishop, I think, no body ever call'd in question upon this occasion: It is well known, that through his long and great Infirmities he could not look into such matters; and when he had better Health, he had things of greater Importance upon his hands. The Repairs ought to have been your Uncle's Province; how he discharged it, appears partly by Mr. *Warren's* Report, annex'd to Mr. *Farrant's* Letter; but much more by the Condition the Palaces of *Lambeth* and *Croydon* were found in, upon the late Survey.

In your Letter to my Lord of *Canterbury*, Oct. 20th, 1716, which probably was never sent, (for his Grace never receiv'd it) you assert, that the late Archbishop was a Lender of Money, from the Fire of *London* to the Year 1715. If you mean any thing, you mean, he lent Money at Interest all that time; and if so, I believe, all who have a just Regard for his Grace's Memory, think you have done it very little Honour by such a Publication. But this shews how difficult it is to heap Scandal upon the Living, without sinking the Character of the Dead.

I have only one thing more, and it is in answer to that most scandalous Paragraph in your last Page, where you would make it believ'd, That my Lord Archbishop had Intentions of suing for a Royal Licence to pull down some of the Buildings at *Croydon* and *Lambeth*; and that while with one Hand he receives great Sums for Repairs, with the other he raises those Buildings, upon which, by the Survey, the Arbitrators were induced to believe the Money by them awarded would be laid out. To this I say, that this Suggestion is very untrue, forasmuch as, in all the Discourse I ever had with his Grace about these Dilapidations, he would never hear of such
a Pro-

a Proposal ; it being his settled Resolution, as I have often had the Honour to hear him say, to fit up the Palace of *Croydon* as well as he was able, and to endeavour to prevail with some of his Acquaintance to live in it, to keep it warm, and in a habitable condition. As to *Lambeth House*, I presume, no body but the Archdeacon of *Cartharthen* ever thought of taking down any Parts of that Palace, which were to be repaired by the Survey ; and upon which the Archbishop is obliged by the Arbitration to lay out the Money allotted, under the Penalty of forfeiting double the Sum.

Now, Sir, to conclude, the whole matter comes to this.

1. Whether the Repairs, demanded upon this Survey, are not absolutely necessary, to keep the Palaces of *Lambeth* and *Croydon* from falling into a state utterly and irretrievably ruinous. And for this you have not only my Opinion, while I was thought well enough of to be chosen the only Judge between the present Archbishop and you, without being admitted to have another joined with me ; but you have also the Sentiments of Mr. *Dickenson*, your Surveyor, who freely owned the Necessity of these Repairs before the Arbitrators, and of eight Artificers, all Men of honest Reputation : So that you have nothing to complain of upon this head, unless you would charge us all with conspiring together to do you wrong, which I hope our Characters in the World will sufficiently vindicate us from.

2. The next Question is, whether or no the Rates set upon these Repairs were fair and honest ? And these were determin'd, as I have shewn already, by the joint Consent of reputable Workmen, chosen on your part, as well as on the Archbishop's, and adjusted with as much Fairness on both sides, as if the Workmen had been contracting for themselves.

3. The third Question is, at whose Expence these Repairs ought to be done ? This is a Case in Law, and if the Law gives it against the Executors, where there is perhaps 40000 *l.* after 21 Years Possession, to answer them ; and neither Wife nor Child of the late Archbishop's to want it ; there can be no reason why the present Archbishop should add this to his other unavoidable Charges, in tenderness to these poor Executors. Whether the Law does charge these Repairs upon the Executors, I never took upon me to judge : But this has been determined by the Lord Chief Justice *King*, and Dr. *Bettesworth*, Dean of the Arches, who were chosen Arbitrators in this Affair. So that all your Cry of being oppressed and wronged terminates here at last, and is thrown upon the Referees, who are not only celebrated for an extraordinary Knowledge in the Laws, but likewise for their untainted Honour and Integrity in all their Practice and Administration of Justice.

4. You

4. You seem to doubt whether his Grace will employ all this Money to the necessary Purposes, for which it is paid. If he does not, and I will venture to say, above a Thousand Pounds more than his Grace has receiv'd of the Executors, you shall be allowed to complain as loudly as you can. But if he does this, either those Palaces must be in a very bad state, or his Grace not so scandalous a Lover of Money, as your mannerly *Latin Sentences* represent him.

Now how far the Pains you have, with so little Reason and Truth, taken, through my Sides to wound his Grace, to make his Name odious, and his Character scandalous : How far, I say, this is agreeable to good Manners and common Honesty, to the Duty you owe your Bishop and Metropolitan, and to your own Character as a Clergyman ; I leave to the World to judge, and you to consider. I am, Sir,

Greenwich, Feb. 20th.

Your Humble Servant,

1716-7.

JOHN JAMES.

